

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/728,572	11/30/2000	Andrew Kuzma	042390.P9903	4316	
75	590 05/03/2004		EXAM	INER	
Chun M. Ng			TABATABAI, ABOLFAZL		
	KOLOFF, TAYLOR & Z Boulevard, 7th Floor	AFMAN LLP	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	CA 90025-1026		2625		
			DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004	, 7	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· •		m	ı
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/728,572	KUZMA, ANDREW	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del>
	Abolfazl Tabatabai	2625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	a timely filed amendment which     (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	ition in
_	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (continuous)	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appr originally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	etion(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	I be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	r reconsideration has been consi <u>se Continuation Sheet</u> .	dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
<ol> <li>For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w</li> </ol>			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. $igotimes$ The drawing correction filed on is a) $igodot$ app	proved or b)⊠ disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
0. Other:	TA	1 AA A	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 10. Other: In response to applicant's remarks the references read on the claim limitations as stated in the final action for example, Applicant argues in essence that Downs does not disclose the watermark is itself used in any way to determine the degradation of content received from a network. This limitation is taught by Downs (see column 22, lines 2-11), also Downs discloses at least one monitor station to receive said content over said network and analyzing said digital watermark for information indicative of degradation of said content (see column 53, lines 60-64; column 67, lines 35-43 and column 84, lines 11-31)..